IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE TENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 2203 of 2005

Between:

Ponduri Ramaiah, S/o. Narayana,
Potluru Village, Savalyapuram Mandal,
Guntur District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The District Collector, Guntur.
2 The Joint Collector, Guntur.
3 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Narasaraopet, Guntur District.
4 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Savalyapuram Mandal, Guntur District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, order or direction declaring the impugned Proceedings A.C.D.Dis.No. 22/2003-S7, dated 7-10-2004 on the file of the Joint Collector, Guntur confirming the orders of the Revenue Divisional Officer, Narasaraopet in Rc.No. 1402/2002-B, dated 11-2-2003 as illegal arbitrary and violation of principles of natural justice and to pass such other order or orders.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.D.KRISHNA MURTHY

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR CIVIL SUPPLIES

The Court at the stage of admission made the following ORDER:

The authorization of the petitioner, as a fair price shop dealer, was cancelled by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Narasaraopet, the third respondent, through his order dated 11.02.2003. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the second respondent. The appeal was dismissed on 07.10.2004. The petitioner claims to have presented a revision before the first respondent. His grievance is that the first respondent has not passed any interim order in his favour, enabling him to run the fair price shop.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Civil Supplies.

The third respondent cancelled the authorization of the petitioner, after issuing a show cause notice. The appeal preferred by the petitioner was dismissed by the second respondent. It is not a case where the petitioner had the benefit of the very interim order, during the pendency of the appeal before the second respondent. In that view of the matter, the petitioner cannot expect any orders from the first respondent. At the most, the first respondent can be required to dispose of the revision without any further delay.

Hence, the writ petition is disposed of directing that the first respondent shall dispose of the revision, as early as possible, and not later than six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

10.02.2005

ksld

To

1 The District Collector, Guntur.
2 The Joint Collector, Guntur.
3 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Narasaraopet, Guntur District.
4 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Savalyapuram Mandal, Guntur District.

5 Two CCs. to the G.P. for Civil Supplies, High Court of A.P.,

Hyderabad (OUT)

6 Two CD copies.